

University of Groningen

Fonologie en morfologie van het Stellingswerfs

Bloemhoff, Hendrik

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

1991

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Bloemhoff, H. (1991). *Fonologie en morfologie van het Stellingswerfs: een toetsing van de natuurlijke generatieve fonologie*. s.n.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Summary

This study of synchronically, diachronically and dialect geographically determined sound and form phenomena in Stellingwerfs makes a contribution to discussions in the field of generative phonology on the possible types of phonological rules and the conditions which have to be imposed on such rules, for example with regard to their phonological or morphosyntactic character, the extent of abstraction of the segments to which the rules can apply, the potential of rules to participate in an 'extrinsic' ordering relation, the manner in which they can be added to a grammar and their relationship to suprasegmental structures such as the syllable. The construction of the syllable and its position in other phonological structures are also discussed. In a number of cases material from one or several other dialects, mostly from the Eastern Netherlands, is (also) taken into account.

On the basis of analyses of a great variety of linguistic material the restrictions which Natural Generative Phonology (NGP) imposes on generative grammar are examined, here based on Joan B. Hooper's version (Hooper 1976), which is universally regarded as the standard version. The test situations are constantly found in the descriptions and discussions of a great number of different types of alternation. These are set out in various sections of three chapters, which are concerned successively with *verb paradigm* (Chapter 1), *the formation of diminutives and plurals* (Chapter 2) and *syllables and segments* (Chapter 3).

NGP is the most clearly articulated variant of so-called concrete phonology. Particularly the True Generalization Condition (TGC), the No-Ordering Condition (NOC) and the formal properties of phonological and morphonological rules in this theory brought about the emergence of a significant 'concrete direction' in generative phonology, which has been an important trend until the present day. From the study of Stellingwerfs in question it appears to be patently obvious that many types of alternation do not correspond to the requirements which natural languages should fulfil according to NGP. Thus neither the strict division between phonological and morphonological rules, which is effected by the TGC, nor the alleged non-phonological character of morphonological rules in NGP can be upheld. In the analyses it is also demonstrated that the TGC may not lead to the rejection of absolute neutralization, while the observational and descriptive inadequacy of the morphonological rules in NGP is not only pointed out - here for the first time -, but also frequently confirmed in test situations. The proposals in NGP with regard to the construction of the syllable and the properties of intersegmental relationships and characteristics within it appear to be unsatisfactory. Although NGP stood at the cradle of the developments in hierarchical phonology which took place in the second half of the seventies and in the eighties, significant components regarding the construction of the syllable are now considered outdated. Investi-

gation of these components can thus be omitted. As compensation, cf. sections 3.5. - 3.7, some recent, hierarchical-phonological partial theories are examined with respect to their merits, on the basis of material from Stellingwerfs.

The introductory chapter (0.) is in the main concerned with the place of NGP in the generative tradition. In section 0.1.0.1. the relevance of the study is outlined against the background of the state of generative phonology in the second half of the eighties. Important variants of fairly popular lexical phonology (i.e. those with plenty of evidence) again permit a great measure of abstractness, which is doubted by many phonologists or even made implausible by experiment. Therefore, more than ten years after the publication of Hooper 1976, the call for testing alternative models like NGP is still heard, now with renewed motivation, as a consequence of the growing doubts about lexical phonology.

The relevance of the present study in itself may be formulated as the necessity for testing NGP on an extensive corpus, combined with the importance of a description of Stellingwerfs as illustrated in particular in sections 0.1.0.1., 0.2.1., 0.2.2. and 0.4.

Following the summary of the aims and plan in section 0.1.0.2., the choice of Stellingwerfs is explained and motivated in section 0.1.1. and the lexical segments in the vernacular are then presented in section 0.1.2. Section 0.1.3. contains an introduction to the theoretical linguistic discussion which laid the foundations for NGP. In section 0.2.1. the metatheoretical position of NGP in relation to that of Standard Generative Phonology is outlined. Linguistic history and in particular linguistic geography - and therefore dialectology - offer excellent possibilities for testing linguistic theories. The positive and unique role played by linguistic geography is defined in section 0.2.4. A differentiation in respect of the role of linguistic history is presented in the preceding section 0.2.3.

In section 0.2.2. an explanation is offered as to why lexical phonology, which to a significant extent determined the face of generative phonology in the eighties, offers no acceptable alternative to NGP, and is, moreover, inadequate for the description of Stellingwerfs. Thus in this language rules exist which are dependent on the phonological and/or syntactic context *outside the lexicon* although they still need lexical information, i.e. respond to diacritic signs. The neo-SPE-model of Richard W. Sproat (1985) provides in principle lexical information in all areas, i.e. not only within the word, but also in the domain of sentence phonology. It thus forms a good alternative to any lexical-phonological model and here obtains independent evidence from Stellingwerfs.

The formal elaboration of the restrictions on the phonological and morphological parts of grammar, which are advanced in the framework of NGP is included in sections 0.3.1. - 0.3.3. Critical notes on NGP follow in section 0.4., still largely independent of the test results.

In Chapter 1 the vowel alternations in the present tense are first discussed. The related behaviour of the theme vowel is also taken into consideration. Whereas a NGP-description would include a great number of morphonological rules, it seems to be preferable to trace vowel alternations back to a standard generative mechanism of two rules, in which, contrary to the demands of NGP, the phonological properties are significant (section 1.1.1.). In the following section (1.1.2.) absolute neutralization of the theme vowel is made plausible, thereby refuting the TGC. In section 1.2. vowel alternations in the past tense are discussed. The changes which occurred in vowel gradations point to the actual working of process rules and not to the (static) distribution rules, which a NGP-phonologist would demand. Rule addition also seems to progress in a different fashion than would be expected within the NGP framework, for in the case under discussion no general first stages of phonological rules occur; the changes evidently concern the output of some morphophonological rules. The descriptive inadequacy of such rules in NGP is apparent here and also, for example, in the following section. In section 1.3. nine arguments against the NGP distribution rule are reviewed, whilst rules related to these in the works of P.M. Tiersma and L. Wetzels find no favour either. The cases of alternation conditioned by syntactic position, which are described in section 1.4., would have to be considered as morphonological in the NGP framework and described in distribution rules. They are, however, virtually entirely phonological in nature, just like the clitic alternations listed in section 1.5. In NGP the changes of the participating alternating segments incorrectly get the status of distribution rules. Other alternations presented in section 1.4. seem in fact to be of a morphonological nature, but on closer examination they prove to be very dependent on phonological properties of the relevant rules. In the case of advanced dissimilation of diphthongs (section 1.6.) it is evident that extrinsic ordering does not have to be rejected, which NGP does with the aid of the TGC and NOC, whilst the lexical character of the relevant formations, to which NGP is committed, appears to have to be denied. A ban on the extrinsic ordering of phonological rules cannot be accepted either in the case of the relationship between the phonological rules in section 1.7. In section 1.8. it appears that morphonological levelling/extension can sooner be accounted for by the phonological process character of morphonological rules and morphonological tendencies which are not integrated into NGP, than from the possibilities which NGP offers as an explanation, i.e. in particular the elsewhere condition and the Humboldt principle or 'One Meaning One Form' (OMOF).

In Chapter 2 a number of alternation types relating to the formation of the diminutive and plural are discussed. Following the description of a great number of process mechanisms in section 2.1., historical linguistic peculiarities of the Eastern Dutch diminutive suffix are set out in section 2.2. The changes under discussion and also the synchronic description speak against a strict division between phonological and morphonological rules as is the case in NGP.

The nature of the (diachronic) changes in the diminutive suffix (section 2.3.) emphasizes the (also) phonologically determined character of the synchronic morphosyntactic rules relating to the diminutive suffix. An attempt to account for the most diverse alternations relating to the diminutive by distributional treatment along NGP-lines proves to be a failure in section 2.4. In section 2.5. it emerges that the formation of the plural in Stellingwerfs can be better explained in standard generative terms. The rule typological findings in this second chapter - all contrary to NGP - are more explicitly summarized in section 2.6. than is possible here.

In 3.0., the introductory section of Chapter 3, it is expounded that NGP is only partly relevant on the point of the construction of the syllable in present hierarchical phonology. In connection with this fact, the purpose of this chapter is disclosed. In section 3.1. the structure of the syllable in Stellingwerfs and also a number of properties of segments in relation to the syllable are discussed by taking the material collected into consideration. Evidently, in a description of Stellingwerfs, there must be room for the *foot* and *phonological word*, hierarchical phonological artefacts which are missing in NGP. Section 3.2. lists a number of suprasyllabic limitations on sequential structure, which have to be described in terms of the templates given in 3.1., and thus motivate them. Directly before this a shortcoming in generative phonology is revealed concerning the principal difference between positive and negative conditions.

As is evident from material from Stellingwerfs, there are phonological rules which are dependent on phonological templates, although within that phonological domain they are - in NGP terms - morphosyntactically determined, because they are not general. Stellingwerfs also has a rule which is apparently only relevant for a phonological template, is however semantically motivated and also added to the language with this property. NGP does not accommodate these remarkable types of rule as described in section 3.3. In section 3.4. the treatment of the artefact 'strengthening' in NGP is concretized.

Ambisyllabicity, or alternatively gemination after the short vowel word-internally, is rejected for Stellingwerfs and as a result strongly doubted for Dutch in section 3.5. The universal syllable constituent 'rhyme' deserves, as is apparent in section 3.6., an additional segment position, whereas in the last section, 3.7., the artefact of the parametrization of vowel insertion, which is handled in recent literature, is rejected on account of phenomena both in Stellingwerfs and in Dutch.

The global character of a summary implies that a number of details which are of importance in the framework of a research report as a whole, because they support the general conclusion, are not always quoted here by section. For this reason a subject index of the main terms which play a role in the examination and the accompanying argumentation has been included on pages 329 ff.

The general conclusion is that none of the restrictions proposed in NGP and examined here can be upheld. In short, the way in which possible and impossible grammars are defined within the bounds of this theory, or, to put it another

way, the findings in this theory with regard to universals, seem to be aprioristic and founded to too small a degree on empirical research, so that in fact by means of analyses of alternation types, such as the ones proposed here, the theory of NGP must be rejected completely.

The foregoing implies a warning to concrete phonologists in general: not only has it yet to be clarified how abstract phonology may be - this is indeed a question of continual empirical research, as affirmed by phonologists from the 'abstract camp' - but likewise the question must be raised - from the opposite point of view - to what extent could some phonology be concrete in principle at all? *The study in hand illustrates that many types of alternation simply cannot be forced into the NGP-straitjacket, or indeed only with the utmost difficulty. Thus it is made clear that this study of the types of alternation in Stellingwerfs brings the discussion back to the ('genuinely scientific') point of departure in which on the basis of the phenomena, i.e. the linguistic facts, regularities are postulated; subsequently a greater degree of reality is attributed to them.* Future research may well reveal which conditions rules meet, with the necessary consequences for the description of the universal framework within which grammars are possible.

Often explicitly and not infrequently also implicitly, this study illustrates that, and how, research into dialects and linguistic geography can make a contribution to modern linguistics. Of these two factors it is linguistic geography rather than dialect which plays a truly unique role. However, because in a linguistic sense there is no fundamental difference between languages and dialects, linguistic research into dialects without an accompanying study of linguistic geography can only be of particular significance if a number of different dialects are examined.